

REMARKS


As amended, claim 1 calls for writing back to a disk, two different cache lines and one write request. The cited Mandal reference is silent as to whether he writes back anything as one coalesced write request. Even if the Examiner continues to disagree, it is clear that Mandal says nothing about whether two cache lines are written back in one write request.

The material in paragraph 71, rather than teaching the claimed invention, indicates that it does not do what is claimed. The language quoted in the last office action "that the cache has little chance to coalesce random writes and instead acts more like a speed matching buffer" does not teach coalescing random writes, but says that such a random write coalescing is not possible. The reference never teaches anything positive about how you coalesce random writes. It simply says it has little chance to coalesce random writes. Rather than teaching coalescing random writes, it teaches away from coalescing random writes. Instead, what is done in the cited reference is to take "small sequential writes and coalesce[s] them into larger writes." See paragraph 71. Here, what is claimed is taking different cache lines and coalescing them into one write, which is nowhere suggested in the cited reference.

The assertion that it is obvious to search in two directions relative to claim 7 and claim 8, because it is inherent to do so is certainly questionable. One could search in one direction and that would be good enough. There is no reason that you have to search in two directions as claimed. No such reason is ever provided and, therefore, an argument of inherency fails under M.P.E.P. § 2112.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 31, 2007



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation